Review
Author(s): Ludlow Bull
Review by: Ludlow Bull
Source: *The Classical Weekly*, Vol. 31, No. 12 (Jan. 31, 1938), pp. 119-120
Published by: The Johns Hopkins University Press
Stable URL: http://www.jstor.org/stable/4340196
Accessed: 19-06-2016 05:19 UTC

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at
http://about.jstor.org/terms

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

The Johns Hopkins University Press is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *The Classical Weekly*

This content downloaded from 165.193.178.102 on Sun, 19 Jun 2016 05:19:47 UTC
All use subject to http://about.jstor.org/terms

By this theory the authority of Alexandrian scholarship is lent to the supposition that there was some sort of uprising of the Messenians at the time referred to and that Aristomenes, the romantic hero of Rhianus's epic, is to be associated with that uprising rather than with the revolt of the seventh century B. C., traditionally known as the Second Messenian War.

Kroymann subjects the various arguments that have been brought forward in support of this theory to a rigorous scrutiny. He concludes that the theory is erroneous and that the events described by Rhianus were conceived of as having taken place at the time to which the Second Messenian War is commonly assigned by tradition, about 650 B. C. or shortly thereafter. Important steps in his reasoning are as follows. (1) He elaborates the arguments of Beloch and others in support of the view that the Leotychidas mentioned by Rhianus was not the famous king of that name but an earlier Leotychidas listed in Herodotus's genealogy of the Eurypontid house (8.131). (2) He contends that the passage of Pausanias (4.23.5-9) which brings Aristomenes chronologically into connection with Anaxilas, the tyrant of Rhegium, is a fictitious invention; this contention is based upon alleged differences in style between the passage in question and the portions of Pausanias's narrative that are clearly derived from Rhianus, upon the presence in the passage of echoes from Herodotus and Thucydides, and upon the fact that it is marked off at the beginning and at the end (in sections 4 and 10) by detailed chronological discussions which cannot have come from an epic poem. (3) He argues that the Damagetus who married one of the daughters of Aristomenes belonged back in the seventh century B. C. and that the genealogical table given by Pausanias (4.24.3) was a falsification designed to bring Aristomenes into closer relationship with the famous Olympic victor Diagoras; it was the work of the same Messenian historical writer who was responsible for the Anaxilas episode, and its purpose was the same, to lend glamor and interest to the story of a people whose actual history was so largely one of drab servitude. (4) He ascribes to the same unreliable source the statement that Damothoïdas of Lepreum and Theopompus of Heraea married other daughters of Aristomenes (Pausanias 4.24.1); these men have been identified by Hiller von Gaertringen, with considerable probability, as Olympic victors of the fifth century B. C. (5) He stresses the significance of the fact that various seventh-century personages are named in connection with the story of Aristomenes's exploits.

Some of Kroymann's arguments are decidedly less cogent than others, but the cumulative effect of his reasoning is impressive. There are, however, so many elements of uncertainty in connection with the whole matter that unanimity among students of the problem is unlikely. The hypothetical Messenian uprising at the beginning of the fifth century B. C. is a ghost that has probably not even now been finally laid.

L. R. SHERO

Swarthmore College
Swarthmore, Pa.

The Art of Ancient Egypt. Published by the Phaidon Press, with an introduction by Prof. Hermann Ranke; pp. 22, 341 illustrations. New York: Oxford University Press, 1936. $2.50

The Phaidon Press has put together a large number of excellent reproductions of ancient Egyptian architecture, sculpture, painting and applied art from all periods. The Press has been fortunate in securing the aid of Prof. Hermann Ranke, the eminent German egyptologist who will be at the University of Pennsylvania next fall and who has written a 14-page introduction to the plates. This is necessarily much compressed, but is an authoritative and very readable survey of the history of Egyptian art.

In a Foreword, the publishers state that 'no comprehensive and at the same time reliable work' of the kind has yet appeared, and they seem to imply that this book is the first to meet those requirements, but they were as well met by The Art of Egypt Through the Ages, Sir E. Denison Ross, Ed., (London and New York, 1931), and nearly as well by Weigall's Ancient Egyptian Works of Art (London, 1924) though the latter does not include architecture. It may be true that more collections are represented in the Phaidon work than in these others (the reviewer has not made the count), but the objects chosen for the former from the smaller collections are often of inferior value and interest. There are a number of errors, largely due to hasty editing, of which I have noted the following:

There are several inconsistencies between dates mentioned on the plates and those suggested by the placing of the marginal numbers in the Introduction. The illustrations involved are Nos. 57, 61, 63, 64, 74, and 175. The mastabah chambers (15) are incorrectly spoken of as 'hewn out' instead of built. This is perhaps a mistranslation from German. On p. 17, line 2, for 'monarch' read nomarch, and in the next paragraph for 'successive' read succeeding. On pl. 4 the portico shown is not a part of the pyramid temple, but belongs to a neighboring tomb. On pl. 51 for '2900' read 3200. The name

This content downloaded from 165.193.178.102 on Sun, 19 Jun 2016 05:19:47 UTC
All use subject to http://about.jstor.org/terms

of the subject of No. 61 is Seshem (not Sekhem)-nōfer. A question mark probably belongs after the date of No. 118 as well as after the name. The material of No. 158 is red quartzite, not granite. No. 170 is not in Boston but in the City Art Museum of St. Louis. A question mark should probably be placed after its date. As to No. 169, the weight of opinion certainly places it in the XII Dynasty rather than in the Saïte period 1200 years later. The piece is now in the collection of Mr. C. S. Gulbenkian of London. Nos. 187 and 188 are not from the tomb of Ti, but from that of Mereruka.

The selection of Old Kingdom tomb reliefs might have been improved. There are too many scenes of the herding of animals, of threshing and hunting in the marshes, and none of sowing, baking or brewing, which latter are referred to by Prof. Ranke as favorite subjects (15). The same is true of the Middle Kingdom wooden models. There are too many boats, and better examples of baking and brewing could have been found. The publishers have mis-named two kinds of objects in No. 307. For 'cithers' and 'drums' read sistra and cymbals. The date of Nos. 320-321 is more likely to be XII Dynasty than XVIII.

On p. 13 we are reminded that the Greeks gave the name to the geometrical form we know as the pyramid. The word itself, however, probably has an Egyptian origin. The reader should know that many, if not most, scholars have returned to the view that Thutmose III was the half-nephew and stepson of Hatshepsut rather than her half-brother and husband (18), and also that the expression 'third intermediary' (21) period is not in general use. We know much more of this period than of the two earlier intermediate periods.

One of the principal advantages of this book is its price, which is very moderate given the large number of illustrations and the excellent introduction by Prof. Ranke.

LUDLOW BULL
Metropolitan Museum of Art

Selected Letters of Pliny. By Hubert McNeill Poteat; pp. viii, 224. New York: Heath, 1937. $1.48

This selection consists of one hundred twenty-three letters, including, of course, those to Tacitus on the eruption of Vesuvius in 79 A. D. and the death of the elder Pliny as well as Pliny's letter concerning the Christians in Bithynia and Trajan's rescript. The remaining letters are well chosen and serve to illustrate various aspects of Pliny's life and time.

The text of the Letters and the history of the text have been the subject of many a spirited controversy in the last half century. When E. G. Hardy found a composite volume of Pliny's Letters, with manuscript additions, in the Bodleian library (cod. Auct. L 4.3) in 1889, he thought that he had found the printer's copy of the 1508 Aldine edition. Professor E. T. Merrill, however, soon identified the Bodleian volume as the desk copy of Budaeus. The marginal and interlinear notations as well as the manuscript additions took on great significance when Professor Merrill pointed to the venerable, but vanished, codex Parisinus as the source of many of their readings. On the basis of these and other investigations and conclusions, Professor Merrill constructed the text of the critical edition of Teubner in 1922 (the text had been constituted several years before this date, but printing was delayed owing to the World War). Meanwhile Professors Rand and Lowe found in the Morgan library, of New York, a very old fragment of the Letters and identified it as a portion of the ancient Parisinus. In a subsequent study Professor Rand revealed that Merrill's highly prized readings from the Bodleian composite represented not the pure ten book tradition but a conflation of the nine and ten book families. An interesting by-product of these studies was the discovery of variant readings in the 1508 Pliny. In these skirmishes (some of them may be ranked as pitched battles) the reviewer served his novitiate more than a decade ago, received numerous deep wounds *adverso pectore*, hurled away his shield ignominiously, and retired to other fields. Schuster edited the most recent Teubner edition in 1933. This text, with few variations, has been adopted by Professor Poteat. He has done well to choose a readable text and to refrain from troubling undergraduate students with textual problems for which they have little interest and less understanding.

In the Preface the author says: 'I have attempted to make the notes in this edition clear, accurate, helpful, and interesting. Cross references are few. . . . When other authors appear, their language or their thought is quoted.' In short, these notes have been written solely with a view to meet the young student's needs and to arouse, stimulate, and sustain his interest. They are copious, indeed, but palatable, yes, even delightful, for the undergraduate because they are vivacious, good-humored, and human. There is no attempt on the part of the author to display his scholarship and erudition, yet the notes are scholarly and are based on a sound and accurate knowledge of source material and a wide background of reading. The necessity for thumbing about in the book has been reduced to a minimum, for the footnotes are conveniently arranged at the bottom of each page. Furthermore, cross references are largely eliminated by the simple,

This content downloaded from 165.193.178.102 on Sun, 19 Jun 2016 05:19:47 UTC
All use subject to http://about.jstor.org/terms